Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

PTO/SB/33 (07/05) Approved for use through 06/30/2008. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control

		Docket Number (Optional)			
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		2003UR021			
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the	Application Number		Filed		
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	10/816,510		01 April 2004		
on	First Named Inventor				
on	Evelyn N. Drake et al.				
Signature	Art Unit		Examiner		
Typed or printed name	3663		Scott A.	Hughes	
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.					
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.					
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).  Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.					
1 am the					
applicant/inventor.	/J. Paul Plummer/				
	Signature				
assignee of record of the entire interest.  See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.	J. Paul Plummer				
(Form PTO/SB/96)		Typed or printed name			
attorney or agent of record.  Registration number 40,775	713-431-7360				
		Telephone number			
attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.					
Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34		July 17, 2008 Date			
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.					
*Total of 1 _ forms are submitted.					

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Tradeamrk Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.** 

US Application No.: 10/8168510

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.: 10/816,510 Confirmation No.: 8615

Applicant : DRAKE, Evelyn N. et al.

Filed : 01 April 2004

TC/Art Unit : 3663

Examiner : Scott A. Hughes

Docket No. : 2003UR021

Customer No. : 34477

Titled : Method for Improved Bubble Curtains for Seismic Multiple

**Suppression** 

Mail Stop: AF

Commissioner for Patents

P. O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

The applicants believe that the central issues in the present appeal involve one or more clear errors in fact made by the examiner. The discussion below falls in the category of a claim limitation not met by a reference.

All claims are drawn to a method for increasing the rise time of air bubbles emitted by a diffuser in water (to suppress noise in a marine seismic survey) by applying a chemical additive to the diffuser's surface. (Explanation from the specification: The bubble curtain lasts longer if the bubbles rise slowly.) The chemical additive can be either one that has wetting agent properties, or one that retards bubble coalescence, i.e.

where small bubbles combine to make a larger bubble. (More explanation: large bubbles rise faster than small bubbles.) In independent claim 52, the additive is painted on to the diffuser's surface with a brush; in independent claim 61, the additive is sprayed on; in independent claims 70, 79 and 83, the chemical additive is applied by dunking the diffuser in a container of additive.

All pending claims are rejected as obvious in view of the combination of three references: Behrens, Bernd, and Cosentino. A brief description of each follows.

Behrens discloses using air bubbles emitted by a diffuser (a *bubble curtain*) to suppress noise in a seismic survey. No use of chemical additives is disclosed or suggested. Bernd discloses a method for using bubbles naturally created in a ship's wake to confuse sonar detection of the ship by a submarine, featuring a way of prolonging the life of the bubbles by introducing into the water in the vicinity of the bubbles a chemical additive that will tend to prevent the bubbles from disappearing by dissolving into the water. Cosentino discloses a method of initially priming a blood oxygenator used in open heart surgery to more efficiently flush out extraneous gas by coating the oxygenator surfaces with a wetting agent that prevents the gas from clinging to the surfaces in small bubbles and interfering with the transfer of oxygen to the blood.

Selectively mining these three references, the examiner has found the following elements: (1) use of a bubble curtain to suppress noise in a marine seismic survey (Behrens); (2) identification of the technical problem of prolonging bubble curtain life (Bernd); (3) use of a chemical additive (not applied to a bubble diffuser surface) to prevent bubbles from dissolving in water (Bernd); and (4) applying a wetting agent to the surface of a device (not a bubble diffuser) to prevent existing bubbles from adhering to the device (Cosentino). But in addition to these, for the applicants' claimed invention to be obvious, the examiner at least needs to show that the prior art knows and appreciates all three of the following inventive steps essential to making the applicants' invention: (1) an important factor in bubble curtain duration is rise time of the bubbles; (2) smaller bubbles rise more slowly than larger bubbles; and (3) a wetting agent or bubble

US Application No.: 10/8168510

- 3 -

coalescence retardant applied to the bubble emitter surface will cause emitted bubbles to be smaller (wetting agent) or remain small (coalescence retardant). These three factors are the essence of the present invention. None of them are to be found in any of the three references.

More details and supporting information can be found in the "Response to Final Office Action" mailed by the applicants on 6/17/2008. The applicants respectfully request that the application be allowed on the existing claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>17 July, 2008</u> /<u>J. Paul Plummer/</u>

J. Paul Plummer Reg. No. 40,775

ExxonMobil Upstream Research Company P.O. Box 2189 (CORP-URC-NW359) Houston, Texas 77252-2189

Telephone: (713) 431-7360 Facsimile: (713) 431-4664